

**REMARKS**

Claims 20-25, 27 and 28 are pending. Applicants have added a new claim 32. Claim 32 is directed to the same invention as the other pending claims but is “broader” in not being limited to “geometry not capable of being formed by milling.

Reconsideration of the previous rejection of the claims over Moriau under 35 U.S.C. 102 or alternatively over Moriau in view of Serino et al. under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Initially Applicants point out that anticipation of 35 U.S.C. 102(b) requires identity of the invention and a single reference which teaches, expressly or inherently, the claimed invention. See MPEP 2131 and cases cited therein. Moriau simply does not provide such a teaching. Applicants claims (e.g., Claim 31) requires “an angle sharper than possible by milling”. Whether or not the Examiner believes that such a limitation is not patentable over Moriau is a legal conclusion but does not relieve the Examiner from pointing to the section or sections of Moriau which expressly or inherently teach such limitations. Absent that, the Examiner cannot sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

As to the addition of Serino, Serino not even cited to show an edge of a board having milled and broached portions and therefore does not correct the foregoing deficiencies of Moriau. Thus, even the proposed combination does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the claimed invention.

Withdrawal of the rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

However, Applicants note that a request for suspension for 3 months has been made with the filing of this RCE so that Applicants may present Affidavit/Declaration to evidence in further support of the traverse of the rejections. If the Examiner reaches the Application for action before the evidence is matched with the file, he is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 785-0100.

As to the request for corrected drawings, Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to the specification at page 5, lines 16-23 which already discloses that “undercuts 20 and hooks 21”

shown in Figs. 1d and 2d are illustrated to show cross-section “geometry impossible to manufacture with traditional milling”. *See* also the sentence bridging pages 2-3 as well as page 4., lines 11-15 and 18-25. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the request for additional drawings is requested.

If any fee is necessary to make this paper timely and/or complete, it may be deducted from **deposit account no. 19-4375**.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko  
Registration No. 31,689

TPP/mat  
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 31436DIV

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.  
1615 L Street, N. W., Suite 850  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 785-0100  
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: October 15, 2007